

Amusements, etc., This Evening.

BOOTH'S THEATRE.—"The Lily of France." Miss Helen Temple, J. W. Wallack and Friends. Began.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.—"Married Life." Mrs. John Wood, Miss Emma Holmes, and Friends.

GRAND OPERA HOUSE.—"Round the Clock." Mrs. John Wood, Miss Emma Holmes, and Friends.

OLYMPIA THEATRE.—"La Belle Heloise." Miss Agnes and Friends.

UNION SQUARE THEATRE.—"Agnes." Miss Agnes and Friends.

WALLACK'S THEATRE.—"Our American Cousin." E. A. Solters.

ASSOCIATION HALL.—Lecture. Prof. Pepper.

BARNUM'S MUSEUM, MENAGERIE AND HIPPODROME.—"The Great Exhibition of 1876." Began.

STERNWAY HALL.—Lecture. Rev. Harle.

ST. JAMES' FINE ART ROOMS.—Illustrations of "The Life of the Great." Began.

ST. JAMES' THEATRE.—Sad Francisco Monstrous.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.—"Escaped from Blackwell's Island." Began.

Business Notices

TO THE CONSUMPTIVE.—WILSON'S COMPOUND. This is a new and powerful medicine, and is the only one that will cure the most dangerous cases of consumption. It is sold by all druggists.

BOARDING.—The best place in New-York. Clean, comfortable, and reasonable. Located at 29 West Twenty-ninth Street. Began.

THE SIDE-WHEEL STEAMER CAMBRIDGE. Leaves New-York for New-Haven, at 4 o'clock P. M. for Providence, Boston, Worcester, and Fall River.

PAINTS, FLOURS, equal to imported, a special price. Sent by express to all parts of the country.

HAS PAID SEVEN HUNDRED DOLLARS A DAY. For the use of the "TRAVELER'S GUIDE AND ACCOUNT BOOKS."

DR. B. FRANK LUMBER.—Patent Lumber and Lumber. 1,000 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. Began.

TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

DAILY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$10 per annum. Sent by express to all parts of the country.

WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$2 per annum. Sent by express to all parts of the country.

ADVERTISING RATES.

DAILY TRIBUNE, 50c, 40c, 30c, 20c, and 10c per line. Sent by express to all parts of the country.

WEEKLY TRIBUNE, \$1, \$2, \$3, and \$5 per line. Sent by express to all parts of the country.

TERMS, cash in advance. Address: THE TRIBUNE, New-York.

New-York Daily Tribune.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1872.

The motion for a dissolution of the French Assembly was rejected by a vote of 409 to 201. Destructive foundations have been taken in France. It is rumored that Prince Bismarck will retire from the Presidency of the Prussian Council.

John R. Alden testified in the Credit Mobilier investigation. Representative Snapp made a harmless assault on Civil Service Reform. Attorney-General Ogden of Louisiana protests against the Pinchback usurpation.

The Italian residents denounced foreign consular authorities. Father Burke replied in part to Mr. Frodo. The Commissioner of Public Works presented his annual report. Gold, 124, 124, 124.

That the fire at the Fifth Avenue Hotel was accidental nobody has yet seriously questioned, so that the conclusions of the Fire Marshal will hardly be disputed. But while there was no responsibility for the origin, it is clear that nobody was to blame for the fatal result. This the Coroner is to decide. It would be interesting, however, to know how it happened, that, when the watchman could break open the doors of several rooms, others on the same floor were neglected and the imprisoned inmates suffered to suffocate.

The suspicion that Commodore Vanderbilt has abandoned the idea of building the Underground Railway is a natural one. Some very fine promises made months ago of the early commencement and completion of the work have raised high expectations. Any delay in the beginning of a work so eagerly demanded and so imperatively needed would excite doubts, and give rise to rumors that Mr. Vanderbilt had obtained the charter only to keep others out of the field. We trust soon to see material evidence of his earnestness in this matter.

Representative Snapp of Illinois has been making a speech on Civil Service Reform. Representative Snapp may be rather small game; but one point to which he refers is worth a moment's notice. He charges that the reason why so many newspapers favor reform in the Civil Service is that they are edited by office-holders. Of course, none but Administration editors are office-holders, and is not Civil Service Reform an Administration measure? Do they favor Reform because they are office-holders or because they support the Administration?

Secretary Robeson's order in relation to the treatment of the colored cadet at Annapolis by his comrades ought to give some new ideas to those young men. The Secretary informs them that their persecution of young Conyers is an impotent protest against the spirit of national law; an insolent and unmanly expression of superiority over the solitary representative of a lately oppressed race; and an open defiance of the authority of their superiors, which is a violation of the most comprehensive of their professional duties. This is about the whole case, so far as the cadets are concerned, and it is high time that they learned their own position.

The cases of both Stokes and Tweed are set down for trial to-day in the Court of Oyer and Terminer before Judge Ingraham. Of course one of them must give way—possibly both will go over; but it seems to us that at this moment it is of the utmost importance to proceed with the case of Stokes. The calendar of criminals has been almost wholly finished, and the Tombs nearly cleared of murderers. Singularly enough, the men who did not want to be tried, and who have committed crime since Stokes killed Fisk, have had preference over him, who has been clamorous for trial. Between Tweed and Stokes we think the Court should not hesitate. Tweed is on bail, while Stokes, of course, cannot be bailed. In common humanity as well as simple justice the latter should be tried first, and we hope Judge Ingraham will to-day so decide.

It is reported that Prince Bismarck is about to withdraw from the Prussian Council of Ministers and simply exercise the functions of Chancellor of the Empire. Although this report needs confirmation, it is not without a precedent. In the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which is based on the equality of each of the separate Governments of which it is composed, the division of offices does not work to very great disadvantage. In Germany, where Prussia has a preponderating influence, it is necessary for the policy of the kingdom to be in harmony with that of the Federal Government. The apprehensions which were entertained in Prussia upon this announcement are well-founded. In the present Ministry there is no person of ability enough to carry on the Government upon a sufficiently liberal basis to suit the majority in the Chamber of Deputies; and it is not probable that a successor will be appointed whose views will be

at all in harmony with those of the Chancellor.

The main facts elicited in the Credit Mobilier investigation will leak out; they always do in such cases. Saturday's proceedings were taken up with the evidence of Mr. John B. Alley, ex-Member of Congress from Massachusetts, and an active operator in the Union Pacific Railroad schemes. Both Alley and McComb are said to have a very mean opinion of each other; accordingly, we find that Mr. Alley denies Col. McComb's statements; and that gentleman, in effect, that Mr. Alley is no better than he should be. But the dismal part of all this attempt at secrecy is that nobody can tell how much is suppressed and how much truth really comes to the light. One gleam of light is afforded in the statement that Mr. Oakes Ames is determined to tell the whole truth, without regard to whom it hurts. That is just what is wanted. Up to this date, Mr. Ames has himself been the great sufferer in reputation by the exposures which have been made.

Peru, we hear, is greatly excited over the affair of the coolie ship Maria Luz, and is prepared to threaten China and Japan. We hope our choleric slave-dealing Republic on the Pacific shore of South America will think twice before it attracts any further attention to the disgraceful business in which it is engaged. The Maria Luz was employed to transport coolies from Macao to Peru. She was virtually a slave-trader, and when the nature of her cargo became known in Yokohama, Japan, where the vessel put in under stress of weather, there was an investigation by the Japanese Government. The result was that the poor coolies were taken out of the ship, and, at their own desire, sent back to China, the Chinese Government having sent a High Commissioner to Japan to attend to the case. The whole affair reflects great credit on the so-called semi-civilized Governments of China and Japan. Now that the Christian Republic of Peru proposes to make a row about it, people will be curious to learn just what the grounds of objection can possibly be.

By this time, one would suppose, the Executive has come to the conclusion that the recognition of the Pinchback Government in Louisiana was, to say the least, premature. The statement of Mr. Ogden, Attorney-General of the State, which we print to-day, is clear and dispassionate. Pinchback and his Legislature are put into office by a United States Court, backed by no more substantial evidence of election frauds than reports of United States officers, unknown to State law; they are kept in office by United States troops. Pinchback, who claims to be Acting Governor because he was Lieutenant-Governor when articles of impeachment were preferred against Warmoth, never was term of office expired last November; when Lieut.-Gov. Duma died, Pinchback was chosen presiding officer of the Senate; now he claims to be Governor, because he was once Senator and then acted as Lieut.-Governor; but his term of office has already expired. Pinchback is kept in place, however, by Federal bayonets, and next we hear the State Arsenal is taken into the keeping of Gen. Emory, commanding the Department. The Legislature which has just presented articles of impeachment against Warmoth is guarded by Federal troops. The President's word alone suffices to establish the legality of the contesting claims to the Governorship. If this is not chaos come again, we would like to know what it is.

THE CREDIT MOBILIER INQUIRY.

Mr. Blaine and the other members of the House of Representatives who asked for an immediate inquiry into Col. McComb's story of bribery in connection with the Credit Mobilier, did a better act which has impressed the public in their favor. But the House has made a mistake by ordering the investigation to be held in secret. Already the Committee has been discredited in various non-partisan newspapers, and the wildest tales have been told about testimony suppressed and attempts to cover up the truth. The House has done wrong in treating this story as a mere scandal of the campaign which can be set at rest by a formal report. It is something more serious than that. Whether rightly or wrongly it has thrown more or less suspicion about the characters of men so eminent that when they are defamed the whole body of Congress suffers. They should not rest until, besides getting an official verdict of acquittal, they have dissipated the last doubt from the minds of their political adversaries. Putting aside all prejudice, let us see what is known about this affair, and what remains to be found out.

The Union Pacific Railroad was built by an inside Ring or company, chiefly of its own officers and stockholders, known as the Credit Mobilier. The leading spirit of this company was Mr. Oakes Ames, then and now a Representative in Congress from Massachusetts, and member of the House Committee on Railways and Canals. It was largely to the action of Congress that the Credit Mobilier was indebted for its success. To assist it in raising money, Congress was induced to surrender the first mortgage which it held upon the road and accept a second mortgage instead. Other legislation enormously enriched this favored company, and enabled it to declare almost fabulous dividends. No account of its operations was ever made public. In 1867, however, and 1868, its privileges were seriously menaced in Congress. A bill to restrict the rate of passenger fares and fix a tariff on freights was urged by Mr. C. C. Washburn of Wisconsin; and it was understood that a general overhauling of its affairs, accompanied with the disclosure of some ugly secrets, was about to take place. The danger, however, was averted. The Railroad and the Credit Mobilier not only retained their old privileges, but got some valuable new ones. It was a few days after the introduction of Mr. Washburn's bill that a correspondence took place between Mr. Oakes Ames and one Henry C. McComb, a stockholder in the Credit Mobilier, out of which all the present scandal arose. McComb claimed certain shares of the stock, which Ames refused to surrender, alleging (as it would appear) that they had been allotted to members of Congress to secure their influence. McComb brought suit, and submitted in evidence two letters addressed to him by Mr. Ames. These have been published, and we understand that they are admitted to be genuine. In the first of them, dated Jan. 25, 1868, Mr. Ames says: "Yours of the 23d is at hand, in which you say Senators Bayard and Fowler have written you in relation to 'their stock.' I have spoken to Fowler, but not to Bayard. I have never been introduced to Bayard, but will see him soon. . . .

"I have assigned, so far as I have given, to 'four from Massachusetts; one from New-Hampshire; one, Delaware; one, Tennessee; one-half, Ohio; two, Pennsylvania; one, Indiana; one, Maine; and I have three to place which I shall put where they will do most 'good to us.' In the second letter, dated Jan. 30, 1868, he says: 'You must remember that it was nearly all placed as you saw on 'the list in New-York, and there was but 6 or 8 M. for me to place.' And of a letter from one King, referring apparently to threats of investigation at Washington, he says: 'In view of King's letter and Washburn's 'move here, I go in for making one bond dividend in full.' When these letters were brought to light last September, Senator Bayard published a frank statement of his connection with the affair, from which it appears that he did receive, from Ames through McComb, an offer of one or two thousand dollars of stock, and did write for information about it; but he refused to take it except on the understanding that he should give no equivalent for it in Congress, and should pay for it in the regular way. Perhaps it is needless to add that Senator Bayard did not get any on such terms.

Who did get it? Col. McComb swears that Ames gave him a list of members of Congress to whom the bribe had been, or was to be, offered, and he wrote down the names, from Ames's mouth, on the back of one of the letters already quoted. The list was as follows:

Blaine of Maine, 3,000; Sedgwick and Kelley, 3,000; Patterson of New-York, 3,000; each, 3,000; Wilson, Massachusetts, 2,000; Foster, Tennessee, 2,000; Painter (Rep.), for Boston, Massachusetts, 2,000; Quincy, 2,000; Ames, 2,000; Bingham and Garfield, 2,000; Eliot, Massachusetts, 3,000; Ohio, each, 2,000.

There are some in this catalogue whom it is almost impossible to suspect of dishonesty. Nearly all have made more or less explicit denials. But what are the ascertained facts? Mr. Oakes Ames, Member of Congress, professes in his own handwriting to have bribed his fellow legislators in the interest of the corporation with which he was connected. Senator Bayard confirms the Ames letters in part. Now we want to know whether the rest is true. There are several theories on which the story can be accounted for. These are:

1. That the statements of Ames and McComb are strictly true; this would implicate so many gentlemen of the highest reputation for integrity that we are all unwilling to believe it.

2. That Ames invented the whole story in order to escape giving up the stock which McComb wanted; the statement of Senator Bayard renders this, however, extremely improbable, and the fact that after the date of these alleged transactions the company got from Congress whatever it wanted would be thought significant.

3. That the stock was really offered to the thirteen persons named in the list, but not accepted by all or any of them.

4. That Ames purposely gave a false list in order to protect those with whom he had had dealings.

5. That McComb constructed the list himself from the hints furnished by Ames's letters—knowing the States to which stock had been allotted, and guessing at most of the names.

The present investigation ought not only to give an answer to these conjectures, but to give it in such a way that no doubt can remain in the most prejudiced mind. There are no party interests now to be served or to be hurt by this inquiry. The honor of Congress is involved in it, and cannot be satisfied with an examination at which the most captious critic can find excuse for cavil. It is not enough that the Committee shall do its work honestly; the work should be done openly, so that everybody may see that it is honest. If suspicion is to remain, after the investigation is finished, the trouble will all have been thrown away. Our representatives at Washington must see, if they watch the course of public opinion, that a Committee sitting with closed doors, on a case of this nature, is always distrusted. It may be said, indeed, it is said now, that some of the judges themselves are none too pure, and fear to find out too much. Let us have an end of secrecy. We want to see the last remnant of suspicion removed from the fame of men whom the country has honored among its best citizens; or if there are any rogues in high places, we want to see their guilt exposed so publicly that nobody hereafter can deny it.

THE DEBATE ON DISSOLUTION.

The long-threatened debate in the French Assembly on the question of dissolution took place on Saturday, and has ended, apparently, without any serious result. A very large majority of the members preferred to hold their places in peace rather than go before the people for reelection, and the Government, as represented by M. Dufaure, took unexpectedly strong ground in the same direction. The question of dissolution is, therefore, for the present, so far as the Assembly is concerned, buried under an adverse majority of 400 to 201. The Monarchists in the Chamber and in the press are, of course, in a state of insufferable exultation, and the Radicals calmly and indifferently bide their time.

We see again in this performance, what we have several times noticed before, the great superiority of the Republicans to their opponents in dignity and self-command. In the condensed abstract sent by the cable of M. Gambetta's speech on Saturday, there is no indication of anything in the least provoking or aggressive, nothing of that energetic tone of defiance which is almost always to be observed in the speeches of the leaders of a parliamentary minority. M. Duval had opened the debate with an attack upon the signers and supporters of the petition for dissolution. He indulged, as do all the monarchist speakers and writers, in those unjust and insolent aspersions of the motives of the Republicans which seem to them a mere matter of course. M. Gambetta was not shaken from his habitual reserve by these insults. He referred to the fact that the country had repeatedly manifested its dissent from the policy of the Assembly, by embracing every opportunity to return Democratic in place of Monarchical deputies, even from those districts where the latter were strongest in influence and in traditions. The anxiety consequent upon the recent crisis furnished him with an additional argument for dissolution, so that a homogeneous and practicable Assembly might be elected to decide upon the permanent constitution of the country. He concluded by one of those brilliant and graphic phrases in which he is accustomed to condense the floating impressions of the town, declaring that the monarchy was impossible, because neither a king would accept nor the people ratify. This is probably literally true. It is not likely that any king could receive an election so nearly unanimous as to guarantee the safety of his crown or his head, or to

compel the resulting unanimity of a plebiscite.

But, moderate and careful as this speech evidently was, it was answered by a discourse full of fire and fury by one of the gravest and noblest of French Oratorians. The Duke d'Audiffret-Pasquier attacked the Radicals in a style which ought to be impossible with a man of his age and breeding. As a matter of course he charged the massacres of the Commune to their teachings. Men with minds shaped in the aristocratic molds in which his was formed can see no difference in enormity between obsequing to a king and murdering an archbishop. Both acts seem to them equally atrocious, equally unprincipled. In the evening the Government intervened in the debate through the mouth of M. Dufaure, as M. Thiers, in pursuance of a formerly expressed resolution, did not appear at the session. M. Dufaure, with some other members of the Cabinet, has been rather restive for some time under the hearty support which was given to them by the Left. Even His Excellency the President occasionally wince, when the loyal men of the Mountain applaud him and his old friends on the Right sit in stern and silent disapproval. M. Dufaure was at least determined to have no applause from the Left. He went out of his way in the most uncalculated manner to attack the Republicans. He said, as if it were a final and unanswerable reproach, that M. Gambetta was the cause of this agitation for a dissolution. If this were true, it would not be anything out of the way. Any one who can succeed in bringing about a dissolution of the present Assembly and an election of another in which the popular sentiment could be properly represented would deserve the thanks of his country.

The debate ended with a puerile piece of malice. The Assembly voted to placard the speech of M. Dufaure, and rejected a proposition to give similar publicity to that of M. Gambetta. If the ingenuous youth of France get their oratorical education from these placards, they will lose heavily through the bad taste of the Assembly. But sooner or later the dissolution must come, and the longer it is delayed, the more will the monarchy be discredited in the eyes of France.

THE "MUTUAL LIFE" REVEALED.

There is an armistice in the "life insurance war," which probably presages its termination. The trustees of the Mutual Life Insurance Company have decided to postpone for the present the proposed reduction of rates. It is a fitting conclusion to this very curious affair, that a statement of the present determination is coupled with a declaration that the reduction itself was perfectly justifiable and would have been beneficial to all the policy-holders in the company; and the retrocession is only made "in compliance with the request" of the representatives of other companies. Admitting that this, and this alone, is the motive, the act of the trustees in going back to old rates for fear of injuring the business of their rivals, must be regarded as a marvel of disinterestedness. There was a considerable portion of the public that regarded the outcry of other companies against the Mutual Life's proposed action, as utterly ridiculous. It was compared with a protest which one merchant might make if another undersold him—a cry which would not interfere with the cheaper vender's custom, nor prevent his increased sales to the detriment of his rival. To those who hold such views, the present determination of the trustees may cap the climax of absurdity.

Throughout the whole controversy, taking the arguments put forward by either side and trying them by the ordinary rules of trade, similar contradictions become apparent, and it is no wonder that some of the newspapers designated the varying statements which they published as "The Insurance Muddle." The Mutual Company declared its ability to make the reduction; other concerns, that could not possibly know as much about its affairs, proclaimed its inability. Figures were given on both sides, and neither side disputed the other's bases of calculation, though deducing utterly antagonistic results. If the new measure was so palpably risky as the other companies asserted, the fact that its adoption would place the Mutual Company in a position so dangerous as to prevent it from competing for new business, should have perfectly comforted the rival concerns. If the new rates were, as alleged by the opposition, no cheaper to the assured, their adoption need not hurt the insurance business; for, if the reduction did not reduce the total paid in, how could it diminish the revenue of the companies? Or, again, why need they fear an injurious competition from a company offering terms that were really no better than those of others? Abundant quotations cited from the writings of the very actuaries who over their signatures opposed the reduction, show that they previously advocated such a change, offering strong arguments in its favor.

Equally debatable were the arguments adduced in favor of the measure. The capacity for carrying it out was proved by thirty years' experience; but if so long able to make this deduction, why had the company never attempted it before? Ten per cent, it was said, is enough to cover expenses; but will not everybody admit that more than ten per cent must be paid for the first year's expenses, which include commissions? Whence shall the additional expense be honestly drawn? It is a mutual company, and gives back, to the whole, what it receives on the whole; yet it proposes to give insurance to a class of people that cannot afford it at present rates, though, taking year with year, the amount paid by these people must be the same for the same insurance. Lastly, why, if the proposed change would be "a benefit to all," did the trustees conclude to postpone it indefinitely?

The facts probably are that the original step was taken without due consideration of the possible sentiments of policy-holders. It doubtless developed an opposition among them that was not anticipated. Men who had already placed their funds in the safe-keeping of the company vehemently objected to having an unexpected risk taken, and especially for the benefit of outsiders who as yet own no policies. A large share of the public insured in other companies, fearing that similar reductions might become general, trembled for their own investments. Whatever trustees might privately believe about the beneficence of the proposed measure, they would not care to face a popular storm. The result, on the whole, is not to be regretted. If, as seems probable, the new plan had brought odium on life insurance, or broken down the smaller companies, the disaster would be far greater than any possible good. The weaker companies perform a work which the larger ones cannot and will not; penetrating the Western wilderness and the outskirts of civilization, and insuring the pioneer and the laboring man. True, they do it at great expense; but that diminishes only

their dividends. Even if they fail and wind up, it is the stockholders only who suffer; the policies are gladly assumed by stronger companies, and the grand result of extending the benefits of insurance to the poor and lowly is measurably accomplished.

We think it is not difficult to perceive the principal motives which have brought about both the original and the final action of the trustees. So thinking, we deem it unnecessary to heed the hints thrown out by minor insurance periodicals and sometimes, we are sorry to see, in daily papers—that something wrong on the part of the officers was to be overborne or concealed, either by the measure or its suppression. It is generally believed that the attacks upon different companies which from time to time appear in these lesser periodicals are of the character of black-mail, and to such a theory we should give more credence than to their insinuations. The officers of the Mutual Life have commanded the highest respect for ability and probity, and we believe they deserve it.

"INDEPENDENT JOURNALISM."

Nothing, it appears to us, more fully demonstrates the necessity of an independent newspaper press than to find a journal strenuously asserting that such a thing is impossible, while at the same time it qualifies and equivocates, and avers that so far from being impossible it is the most common thing in the world. Here is a sheet in Connecticut which tells us, to begin with, that it "adores independence in everything," and which ends by convincing us that it admires independence in nothing. For having boldly made a declaration of this same independence, it hastens to assure us that it does not mean "perverted independence," which is "simply contemptible;" and then we are treated to the axiom that "neutrality is untenable." Every journal "should hold itself amenable to some tribunal," and if it does not do so "it is 'dangerous.'" So this unimpeachable independent newspaper concludes as follows: "We recognize a healthy public sentiment as our monitor, and shall shape our course accordingly." Of which we have to say:

I. Neutrality ground being untenable, we advise nobody to try to occupy it. Independence and neutrality seem to us very far from being synonymous. The former implies a reserve of judgment, a determination to look at both sides of a question, a disinclination to take opinions without examination from administrations, or readers from conventions or committees. The latter implies just no opinions at all. The independent journalist, caring everything for measures and nothing for party names, may sustain what appears to it to be wise, and may denounce what appears to be otherwise, and, resolutely determined not to be the mere mouthpiece of men, it escapes the danger of being misled by a personal fealty which neither statesman nor politician has a right to claim. We agree with our cotemporary. Neutrality is "simply contemptible."

II. We have no liking either for "perverted independence." Especially we dislike the kind of which, of late years, we have observed altogether too much. We mean, of course, that independence of the truth which sometimes leads a newspaper to stand fast by its party through thick and through thin; which can see nothing but good in the characters and acts of public men upon its side in politics; which suppresses or garbles or extenuates whatever it may think will be injurious to its party; which does not hesitate to tell little fibs whenever they may be convenient; which does not seek to enlighten the public, but only to persuade it that it is already sufficiently enlightened; which is sharp of vision in detecting the faults of the other side and blind to the faults of its own; and which, having started with the doctrine that party is king, and that the king can do no wrong, goes on stumbling, prevaricating, equivocating, garbling, distorting, suppressing, extenuating, apologizing, and falsifying, and not seldom running the risk of a suspicion of venality and of a belief in candid minds that its patriotism means pro vender.

III. We cannot say either, though there may be a grain of truth in it, that we much relish the proposition that "every journal 'should hold itself amenable to some tribunal.'" Journals are just like men. They are under the same obligation to speak the truth, or that which, after due and conscientious investigation, seems to them to be the truth. But when a man has fairly and squarely determined to say what he thinks, he is amenable to no other tribunal than that of his own conscience. The journal whose positions we are criticising recognizes "a healthy public sentiment as its monitor." But suppose the public sentiment happens to be unhealthy—what then? What becomes of "the monitor?" Besides, it is the business of a newspaper to create and not to follow public sentiment. From any other point of view, journalism seems to us an infinitely degrading and undesirable business. Nobody pretends to like demagogues. Yet here is an editor who proposes to convert the whole body of journalists into demagogues, saying only things which are pleasant to the popular ear, and merely recording the shifting phases of public opinion, if opinion it can be properly called! What would be thought of a clergyman who should announce that he held himself amenable to no other tribunal than his congregation, and should declare the congregational sentiment to be his only monitor? Of course, we have a high respect generally for public opinion, but it has not been our fortune to find it always infallible. We believe in the people, but we have known the people to make great mistakes, and these we have usually taken the liberty of pointing out. A journalist over anxious to think only as the people think, or appear to think, will find often enough occasion to desert the party to which he professes himself so thoroughly devoted, and to put on a new coat every time the majority sees fit to shift from this side to that.

IV. Again we are told that "the only issues 'left to be agitated are Radicalism and Conservatism, and upon one side or the other 'must every honest journalist take his stand.' But suppose we should find too much radicalism in so called conservatism, or too much conservatism in so called radicalism—what then? Are we to be merely the slaves of names and of phrases? Pray, what makes a party good or bad save its measures? And if the measures are bad, or seem to us honestly considering them to be bad, are we to support them because they are the measures of the Republican party, or of the Democratic party, or of the Liberal party, or of any other possible party? If so, then in no possible sense of the word are we "independent." We may have a sort of ownership in our types and our presses, in the general property of our establishment, but we are merely the trustees of the Caucus and the creatures of the Convention. Those who relish this sort of relation

may adhere to it; but we do not. We have expressed our hope and to a certain extent our belief that we are to have an Administration which we can honestly support. We certainly shall not be found capriciously and maliciously opposing it.

AN EXTRAORDINARY YOUNG WOMAN.

We have it upon the authority of *The Columbus (O.) Journal* that recently there was consigned to the county jail there a prisoner plentifully provided with names and surnames. It was the humor of this person sometimes to be called J. F. Goldsborough, occasionally Charles Smith, and then again Mr. Frank Belden. The prisoner was committed for larceny, as we shall presently see, and when received by the jailer wore pantaloons with the air of one accustomed to those garments. It turned out, however, that J. F. Charles-Frank was of the softer sort of sex; that her true baptismal name (alas! that we should be compelled to say so) was Mary, and that she has run such a career, during her twenty-five years of life, as to suggest entirely new views of female capacity, than which no more interesting topic can at present be discussed. Mary, at the age of twenty-three, being determined to live by her wits, had the wit, in the very beginning, to discard her long clothes and to employ a tailor. Making progress in her masculine career, she became barkeeper in a saloon, and dispensed drinks of various sorts to the thrifty of Columbus, who swallowed their beverages in solid ignorance of the angel who ministered unto them. Pursuing the manly scheme of life which she had marked out for herself, she stole \$400 of the spirit-seller's money and (still pantalooned) launched upon a wider and more dangerous sea of enterprise.

In Cincinnati, Mons. Mary was water in a saloon, where she might have continued to dispense chops and to change plates if she had not thought it pertinent to the manly part which she had assumed to worship at the shrine of Bacchus. Her libations being too frequent and possibly too strong, she was deposed from the position of water, when, going to Cleveland, she became still more manly, since there she assumed the arduous role of lover, and laid siege to the affections of Miss Kitty O'Neal, to whom she pledged undying affection. It was a matter of course that Kitty should be left to die of a broken heart, or to live as she could with a damaged one; for the eccentric Mary essayed other achievements of genius. Generally she was a thief, but now and then she deviated (still in pantaloons) into honest ways. Upon the Mahoning Canal she was employed to coerce the fiery chargers. Upon some steamboat she obtained the office of clerk, in which she gave great satisfaction, until the rosy god once more misled her. All this time, she was just as manly as she could possibly be. She smoked the fragrant weed. With a boldness which excites our astonishment, she also mistreated the same. No young gentleman could take perpendicular drinks at the bar with greater frequency and elegance. So went on our epicene, imbibing, snaking, chivving, swearing and making love with just as much audacious impudence as if her name had properly been John or Sam instead of Mary.

But we are obliged to record that this talented dandy tempted fate once too often, and that is why she is now in Columbus Jail. The kind conductor of a railway train from Zanesville to Columbus, supposing her to be an honest gentleman, allowed her to sleep in a caboose car, and she requited this touching benevolence by stealing his gold chronometer—an implement which no conductor can well spare. For this the young woman will for some time to come remain cooped up; but when again at large, a nobler career is yet before her, for she may take to lecturing. She has at any rate done something to vindicate the equality of the sexes. If her garments have been manly, so have been the achievements of this Ohio Moll Flanders, and she has at least demonstrated that in all this world there is nothing sharper than a sharp-witted woman—until she gets into jail.

"Killed by kindness" is a phrase which has just been handsomely illustrated by statistics in England. Who would have believed, save upon the authority of the great Dr. Lankaster, the London coroner, that not less than 3,000 tender infants are annually smothered to death by their mothers who fall asleep in bed while nursing their pledges? Unfortunately, mothers involuntarily kill their children in a great many other ways—by absurd indulgence in diet, by foolish exposure in dressing, and through utter ignorance of the laws of the human system. The only wonder is that the rate, or at least the so-called civilized portion of it, was not long ago utterly exterminated. Babies are called tender—it strikes us that they are remarkably tough.

Miss Emily Faithfull visited the Michigan University, at Ann Arbor, last week, and on entering the Law Department with Prof. Tyler while Judge Cooley was lecturing to 400 or 500 students, she was at once recognized by the young men, who called loudly for a speech. Judge Cooley gave Miss Faithfull his place on the rostrum, and for about half an hour she delighted the audience with some capital stories about the leading men at the English bar, and left the hall amid the wildest demonstrations of enthusiasm on the part of the students for what was characterized by the Professor as one of the best impromptu speeches ever listened to in Ann Arbor.

An Irishwoman, Joanna Murphy by name, and only 45 years old, was recently found dead in her bed in Boston. The coroner came and looked at her, but did not deem it necessary to go further and sit upon her, as "she had evidently died of destitution." We sometimes boast that no person ever starves to death in the United States; possibly more do so than we think. There is suffering which unfortunately seeks relief, and this we are pretty sure to know about; but, alas! the suffering which is silent and must be sought out, too often goes to the death unrelieved.

It is so important for courts to have good ministerial officers that they may safely be entrusted with their appointment. The Supreme Court of the United States has just made an excellent choice of a Marshal in the person of John G. Nicolay, esq., some time Private Secretary to President Lincoln, and afterward Consul to Paris. He won golden opinions in both these positions, and in fact has a habit of doing himself credit in any place he may happen to fill. The Court is to be congratulated upon his election.

Now that those gentlemen of the Western press, who object so strenuously to the crime of being a young man, to say nothing of the further crime of coming from the East, have expressed their protest against Mr. Keenan's conduct of *The Indianapolis Sentinel*, they are beginning to discover that this new editor is giving the people of Indianapolis a better newspaper than they have had for a long time past. Let him keep that up, and his critics will by and by find their ill-tempered opinion gone.

Mr. Bret Harle will deliver this evening, at Steynway Hall, his lecture on "The Arguments of '40.'" To-morrow he will repeat it at the Tabernacle in Brooklyn. The subject is one upon which Mr. Harle is qualified to speak with peculiar familiarity and peculiar grace, and we are not surprised to learn that in Boston his treatment of it was applauded the other night with the loudest applause.